

Remarks

In response to the Office Action mailed on December 27, 2006, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks.

In the present application, claims 10, 13, and 16 have been amended and claims 1-9 and 17-19 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. The claims have been amended to clarify that the source and destination identifiers which are provisioned to create a new permanent virtual connection between two logical ports are different from existing or assigned identifiers. Support for these amendments may be found in Fig. 3 and in paragraphs 0022-0024 in the Specification. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1-7, 9, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditmer et al. (US 6,490,620, hereinafter “Ditmer”) in view of Suzuki (US 5,896,496), in further view of Ashton et al. (US 6,181,679, hereinafter “Ashton”). Claims 10-12 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditmer and Ashton. Claims 13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditmer, Ashton, and Suzuki. Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditmer and Ashton, in further view of “Solving Frame Relay Problems”, pp. 1-14, <http://www.stat.ufl.edu/system/man/portmaster/trouble/FRelay.fm.html> (hereinafter, “frame relay document”).

Applicant’s Statement of the Substance of the Interview

A brief telephonic interview between the undersigned and the Examiner was held on February 15, 2007 to discuss comments made by the Examiner in the Office Action with respect to the rejection of independent claim 10 in view of the Ashton reference. In the interview, a

discussion was held with respect to the claim limitation “wherein the source and destination identifier are different from the displayed identifier” (emphasis added) and the Applicant’s previous arguments directed to the source and destination identifiers being different from existing identifiers. The Examiner opined that the existing claim language did not mandate the interpretation of being different from existing identifiers and suggested that the claim be clarified to recite that the identifiers be different from existing identifiers in order to overcome the Ashton reference.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 13-14 are rejected as being indefinite under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112 and in particular for lacking proper antecedent basis with respect to the term “the existing switch identifiers.” The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Line 4 of amended independent claim 13 has been amended to provide proper antecedent basis for “the existing switch identifiers.” Therefore, the rejection of claim 13 as well as the rejection of claim 14 (which depends from claim 13) under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112, should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-7, 9, and 17-19

Claims 1-7 and 9-20 are rejected as being unpatentable over Ditmer in view of Suzuki and Ashton. Claims 1-7, 9, and 17-19 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer rendering the rejection of these claims as moot.

Claim 8

Although not specifically addressed in the current Office Action, claim 8 was rejected in the previous Office Action and was pending prior to Applicant’s present amendment. With

respect to claim 8, this claim has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer in Applicant's present amendment, thereby rendering the previous rejection of this claim as moot.

Claims 10-12 and 20

Claims 10-12 and 20 are rejected as being unpatentable over Ditmer in view of Ashton. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 10 specifies a method for provisioning a data link connection identifier in a network upon a request from a browser wherein the network comprises at least one permanent virtual connection, and wherein the virtual connection has an endpoint associated with an existing identifier. The method includes connecting a network management system to the first network, wherein the network management system stores the existing identifier prior to the request from the browser; connecting a network management module to the network management system via a second network to obtain the existing identifier; wherein the network management module is capable of remotely displaying the existing identifier over an external third network; querying the network management system with the network management module over the second network; displaying the existing identifier in a web page over the external third network using the network management module in response to the browser request, wherein the request contains at least one of a logical and physical port name, wherein further the web page comprises existing identifier information under nine column headings including at least "Source Switch", "Source Logical Port Name", "Source DLCI", "Source Service Type", "Destination Switch", "Destination Port", "Destination DLCI", "Destination Service Type" and a "Committed Information Rate"; and provisioning a source identifier and a destination identifier for a new permanent virtual connection between two logical ports manually

by a service technician, wherein both the source identifier and the destination identifier differ from the displayed existing identifier.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Ditmer and Ashton fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended claim 10. For example, neither of the aforementioned combinations of references discloses provisioning a source identifier and a destination identifier for a new permanent virtual connection between two logical ports manually by a service technician, wherein both the source identifier and the destination identifier differ from the displayed existing identifier.

Ditmer discusses displaying configuration information for a single PVC and its DLCI and further discusses two DLCIs assigned to a single PVC (see Figures 12-13 and Col. 21, line 15 through Col. 22, line 15). Ditmer is silent however, with respect to provisioning a source identifier and a destination identifier for a new permanent virtual connection between two logical ports manually by a service technician, wherein both the source identifier and the destination identifier differ from the displayed existing identifier, as specified in amended independent claim 10.

Ashton, relied upon in the Office Action for allegedly curing the deficiencies of Ditmer, discusses the manual provisioning of a unique identifier (or DLCI) for new PVC connection by providing alternate or redundant route provisioning between ports in a network. As discussed above, amended claim 10 specifies that a newly provisioned PVC has both a source identifier (source DLCI) and a destination identifier (destination DLCI) which are both different from a displayed existing DLCI. In Ashton (see Fig. 3), the new PVC connections share at least one common source or destination DLCI with an existing PVC (for example, alternate PVCs 261 and 261 both share a common DLCI with PVC 260). Thus, there is no teaching or disclosure in

Ashton of a newly provisioned PVC having both source and destination DLCIs which are not shared with the DLCIs of an existing PVC.

Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Ditmer and Ashton fails to teach, disclose, or suggest all of the features specified in amended claim 10. Therefore, claim 10 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 11-12 and 20 depend from amended independent claim 10 and thus specify at least the same features. Therefore, these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 13 and 16

Claims 13 and 16 are rejected as being unpatentable over Ditmer in view of Ashton and Suzuki. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claims 13 and 16 specify similar features as amended independent claim 10 and thus are allowable over the combination of Ditmer and Ashton for at least the same reasons. Suzuki, relied upon in the Office Action for allegedly curing the deficiencies of Ditmer and Ashton, discusses a permanent connection management system which is capable of transmitting information about a defect of connection state of a PVC (i.e., active or inactive) without giving an excessive load to a transmission path (see Fig. 5 and Col. 2, lines 40-47). Thus, Suzuki is only concerned with existing PVCs and thus only existing identifiers or DLCIs for a port. On the contrary, amended independent claims 13 and 16 specify the provisioning of source and destination identifiers, to create a new PVC between two logical ports, that are different from displayed existing or assigned identifiers. Suzuki merely discusses the communication of state information about existing PVCs but not newly provisioned PVCs with identifiers which are different from displayed existing or assigned identifiers.

Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Ditmer, Ashton, and Suzuki fails to teach, disclose, or suggest all of the features specified in amended claims 13 and 16. Therefore, claims 13 and 16 are allowable and the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

Claims 13-16

Claims 13-16 are rejected as being unpatentable over Ditmer in view of Ashton and frame relay document. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claims 13 and 16 specify similar features as amended independent claim 10 and thus are allowable over the combination of Ditmer and Ashton for at least the same reasons. The frame relay document, relied upon in the Office Action for allegedly curing the deficiencies of Ditmer and Ashton, discusses a troubleshooting table for identifying and diagnosing frame relay problems including possible causes and solutions (see Page 1). The frame relay document also discusses comparing the DLCI numbers assigned by the telephone company with the DLCI list that is actually in use. The DLCI list may be obtained from a “show arp” interface output command which shows the static or dynamic DLCI numbers associated with their IP addresses.

The frame relay document however, is only concerned with existing PVCs and thus only existing identifiers or DLCIs (e.g., the DLCI list may be obtained using the show arp command). On the contrary, amended independent claims 13 and 16 specify the provisioning of source and destination identifiers, to create a new PVC between two logical ports, that are different from displayed existing or assigned identifiers.

Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Ditmer, Ashton, and the frame relay document fails to teach, disclose, or suggest all of the features

specified in amended claims 13 and 16. Therefore, claims 13 and 16 are allowable and the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn. Claims 14-15 depend from amended independent claim 13 and thus specify at least the same features. Therefore, claims 14-15 are also allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 13-16 should also be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

No fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees due or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Date: March 23, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeramie J. Keys/
Jeramie J. Keys, 42724

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, GA 30007-1355
(678) 565-4748